

**TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**April 25, 2007**

Chair Knox White called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:35 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL** – Roll was called and the following recorded.

Members Present:

Michael Krueger  
Robert McFarland  
Acting Chair Robb Ratto  
Eric Schatmeier  
Srikat Subramaniam

Absent:

Jeff Knoth  
John Knox White

Staff Present:

Obaid Khan, Supervising Civil Engineer  
Barry Bergman, Transportation Coordinator  
Eric Fonstein, Development Coordinator

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. March 28, 2007

*Commissioner Krueger* moved approval of the minutes as presented. *Commissioner Schatmeier* seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0, with *Commissioner Subramaniam* and *Commissioner McFarland* abstaining.

3. **AGENDA CHANGES**

None.

4. **COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS**

- a. **Multimodal Circulation Plan**

No meeting had been held since the last report.

- b. **Pedestrian Plan**

No meeting had been held since the last report.

- c. **TSM/TDM Plan**

No meeting had been held since the last report.

5. **Oral Communications — Non-Agendized Items**

None.

**6. Old Business**

None.

**7. New Business**

- 7A. Options for Routing and Stop Locations on AC Transit Line 63 Between the Intersections of Otis Drive at Grand Street and Whitehall Road at Willow Street  
**Outcome:** *TC to provide direction to staff regarding alternatives to be analyzed and appoint subcommittee to work with staff.*

*Staff Bergman* presented the staff report, and summarized the background and scope of this item. The Commission had recommended that bus stops be installed on Otis Drive at the intersection of Pond Isle; that decision was appealed. On March 6, 2007, the City Council reviewed that appeal and directed the Commission to exhaust all options for other stop locations, as well as the potential rerouting of the 63 onto Shoreline Drive, where it previously operated. The staff report also includes information presented by AC Transit, which was read to the Commission at the last meeting, discussing some other issues on Line 63 to provide a broader context for this discussion. Currently, Line 63 operates on a very tight schedule.

*Commissioner Krueger* inquired whether the school routes could be considered part of the discussion, and asked whether it would be possible to serve the school, and cut that part out of the 63 route in order to save running time for a net savings or neutral effect. *Staff Bergman* noted that generally, staff would consider if other routes could be altered, too. He understood that most of the routes also operate on very tight schedules.

**Open public comment.**

*Peter Muzio* believed that a bus stop at Lum School was a bad idea, which he had previously expressed at the City Council meeting. He distributed a letter to the Commission that he had written in opposition to the stop.

*Acting Chair Ratto* noted that could be done at the end of the public comment. He noted that a decision would not be made at this hearing.

*Kevin Dong* noted that he was a homeowner at Otis and Willow, and noted that after attending the City Council meeting, he realized there must be a balance between ridership and run time. He noted that Shoreline had more population density. He questioned the data by AC Transit stating that there was more ridership on the new route, and inquired whether it was because of population growth or the new stop at Whitehall improving the ridership. He noted that the proposed Alameda Landing stop would add 10 minutes to the run time, and that it made this a nonissue. He suggested putting the bus stops where they were wanted or needed, rather than worrying about two or three minutes of run time.

*Susan Decker*, Alameda Transit Advocates, noted that there were tradeoffs, and that it was already difficult for people to get to the hospital because of the reroute to Shoreline. She noted

that Shoreline had poor sidewalks on the beach side. She hoped the reroute would not negatively impact elderly people. She noted that wherever the route goes, she hoped that good stop spacing would be retained in accordance with the transit plan's guidelines.

*Liz Cleves* noted that she was grateful that AC Transit and Public Works was looking at this route so thoroughly. She concurred that the stops at Whitehall and Willow near a convalescent home inadequate. She noted that between Park and Grand, there was a greater density of people on Shoreline compared with the same cross streets on Otis. She distributed an aerial photo of those streets, and believed the stops should be near riders, and not based on run time.

*Diane Voss* believed that Line 63 should be removed from the Town Centre, which is already becoming congested. She noted that passengers carrying packages take longer to board a bus. She stated that the congestion would also bring unsafe conditions due to impatient drivers, and added that run time would be saved by not going through the center itself. She stated that Shoreline is a better location for the route, as it would serve the Hall of Justice and the post office. She said that Lum Elementary students would not use the bus.

*Geoff Kline* noted that he was disappointed that the report did not discuss ridership, nor was safety addressed. He noted that run times and driver breaks were certainly important, but not at the expense of those two items.

*Adrienne Langley-Cook*, Commission on Disabilities, noted that the Post Office had no sidewalk near the bus stop, and that the crosswalks were not totally defined on Shoreline. She believed a crosswalk near the Albertson's would be very valuable and would increase access to Town Centre. She would like to see a wider sidewalk near Shoreline to accommodate seniors and the disabled.

*Kathi Young* noted that she lived at Shoreline and Willow, which meant a long walk to get to the bus. She noted that the stop at Whitehall and Willow was inadequate for disabled access, and that it was dangerous and ill-lit. She believed there should be public transportation along that street, and added that there were some turns at Alameda Point that did not seem to go anywhere.

### **Closed public comment.**

*Commissioner Krueger* requested that AC Transit speak to the ridership issue, and added that no AC Transit service actually made money.

*Sean Diest Lorgion*, AC Transit, said that they wish to provide service to higher density areas.

*Commissioner Krueger* inquired how much the ridership might increase, and whether there was any ridership from the lagoon homes that would be lost. *Mr. Diest Lorgion* noted that the current bus stop was at Willow and Whitehall, which would still be used if the route went on Shoreline; no bus stops would be lost. He was concerned about possibly removing service from South Shore.

*Commissioner Krueger* inquired how much additional fare box revenue the new routing would bring in. *Mr. Diest Lorgion* estimated it would be about 25 extra riders a day at an average fare of 70 cents, which would not pay for itself. He noted that the current route has about 1800 passengers a day, and that an extra 25 passengers per day was a small addition.

*Staff Khan* noted that 25 riders per day would add approximately \$6800 annually at 70 cents average fare, while the annual cost of operating a bus is at least \$300,000 a year.

*Acting Chair Ratto* requested that the letters be read into the record by *Staff Bergman*:

Submitted by *Chair John Knox White*: “The Line 63 is already not meeting the needs of its current riders. The delays on the line have created a sporadic and unpredictable service, causing usability to diminish. Before any changes in routing are considered for a specific portion of the line, priority needs to be given to providing Alamedans with a service that meets its schedule. This means removing up to four minutes of run time, or adding another bus. Given AC Transit’s current finances and current proposed losses from the State totally \$7 million this year, and \$5 million a year in perpetuity thereafter, increase in the operational cost of the line by 25% should only be considered if service cuts elsewhere will not take place. If staff’s comment is correct, other service improvements in Alameda, such as extending the Line 51 to Fruitvale should be identified for what the additional \$300-500,000 could provide.

“Line 63 already makes an incredibly circuitous route, making the line difficult to use for riders heading to Oakland from west of Webster Street. Adding run time should only be done in connection with the implementation of other service efficiencies. With regards to Otis versus Shoreline, AC Transit should identify the ridership potential for both Otis routing of the Line W and Shoreline routing of the Line 63. It makes sense that the same routing should be used for the two lines. We should know the ridership potential for all lines on both streets. We need to be aware of the cost effectiveness of the switch if it entails adding another bus to the route. Staff should determine if the additional ridership can offset adding an additional bus. At an annual fare box recovery of \$875 per full-fare, five day a week rider, 342 new daily riders would be needed to fully recover an additional bus.

“Staff should consider a two-phase approach if additional operational efficiencies cannot be found to make identified switches. Phase One: Keep the existing routing, install stops as per TC recommendation, and reduce overall runtime to meet schedule needs. Phase Two: Integrate Alameda Landing transit needs with Line 63, look at bifurcating the two lines in order to reduce scheduled run times to both west end and east end lines, and making routing changes identified at that time.”

Received from *Ursula Apel*: “Dear Members of the City Council and Transportation Commission: I was delighted to hear of plans to install a new Line 63 bus stop on Otis Drive near Lum School. My husband and I live on Kitty Hawk Road, so our closest stop now is the one at Whitehall and Willow, which has no sidewalk on the north side, and no marked crosswalk on Whitehall. I am in my 70s, and like many senior citizens, I find it much easier to carry groceries and other purchases home if I can take a bus for as much of my trip as possible. If there were a stop at Lum School, I would have only a short walk to my home, and a stop at Pond Isle would

also be convenient for me and for others in my neighborhood who live on Yorkshire, Greenbriar and other streets. Several of my neighbors who ride the bus do not speak English very well, so I have agreed to speak for them. One suffers from cancer, and has lost the use of her arms, so she is unable to drive. My husband also cannot drive, but he enjoys going to the coffee shops at the shopping center. Due to his heart problems, he has to walk slowly and rest often. Taking the bus would allow him to get there faster, while still walking the short distance to the stop, which would be good for his health.

“I know that people who live on Otis have their own concerns about parking and other issues, but a good system of bus stops and sidewalks is an asset to the whole community. I used to take the 63 when it ran on Shoreline, and the bus stops there were not the best. When I stepped off the bus, my feet would sink into the sand because there is no sidewalk on the beach side. I don’t think a wheelchair could use these stops safely. Although putting the 63 back on Shoreline would make it convenient for the many people who live on that street, I ask that you please not do so unless a more stable surface can be provided for people getting on and off the bus. Whatever the City decides about the best locations for 63 stops, I hope you remember how important it is for citizens to have access to public transportation. That means not only providing frequent stops, but also ensuring that well-kept, usable sidewalks and other walkways lead to those stops. The elderly, disabled, and many other depend on having good bus stops close to us.”

Received from *Peter Muzio*: “After reviewing the notes posted online concerning this agenda item, I noted that 27 people had actually taken the time to write and/or attend meetings here at City Hall. All of the 27 people are opposed to adding any bus stops to Otis Drive between Willow and Grand. However, the City is for either one or two additional bus stops. By reading the online file notes, it is apparent that an unidentified person on City staff, for reasons unknown, really wants a bus stop at Lum School. City staff indicated initially that a bus stop at Lum School would be approximately halfway between the existing bus stops at Grand and Willow. To that end, the Transportation Committee [*sic.*] was tasked with evaluating the situation. They determined that Lum School is not centered between Grand and Willow, so they recommended a bus stop be installed near Ivy Walk. This located would be approximately centered between the existing bus stops at Grand and Willow. As this I’d not coincide with the wishes of the City staff, City staff requested that two sets of bus stops be installed so they could still get the desired stop at Lum School. So the score is one big (City staff) vote for two bus stops, one medium (Transportation Commission) vote for one bus stop, and 27 little (residents along Otis Drive) votes against additional bus stops. At the City Council meeting on March 6, 2007, additional people (parents of children attending Lum School) spoke against the reinstallation of the bus stops at Lum School.

“Having just reviewed the additional run time and cost information provided in advance of the April 25, 2007, Transportation Commission meeting, it is apparent that barring a magical funding source, the 63 bus line needs to cut the number of bus stops along its route, not increase the number of stops.

“As you already know, people at the Willow (east) end of the subject area who do not want an additional bus stop because City Councils do not require builders to provide sufficient off-street

parking at multiple unit buildings, and therefore, they really need to on-street parking spaces. I'm sure they will tell you they are well-served by the existing bus stop at Willow and Whitehall.

"Otis Drive is a wide street with limited access. Between Willow and Grand, only Sand Creek Way intersects it on the south side, and Sand Creek does not go south to the beach. The "isles" which intersect on the north side are all one-block, dead-end *cul de sacs*. It is natural for people to drive fast on Otis than they would on a narrower street or a street with cross streets every block. This is why visibility is so important to pedestrians. The people near the proposed Lum School location are seriously concerned about pedestrian safety is a bus stop is placed such that it blocks the visibility of oncoming traffic. The proposed bus stop location in front of 1815 Otis is on the wrong side of the crosswalk. Ditto the proposed eastbound stop. This is the reason there has been so much opposition to this bus stop.

"Safety problem #1: It is safer to have bus stops located where cross streets and crosswalks are located at the rear of the bus, rather than in front of the bus. This allows pedestrians to see oncoming traffic, and traffic to see the pedestrians. The proposed bus stops at Lum School have the megabuck crosswalk in front of the bus. This is the least safe location. People exiting the bus will be drawn to the front of the bus to cross the street. Some of the correspondents on this subject suggest that the crossing guards will prevent people from crossing the street while the bus is present. They fail to consider that the school is in session 185 days out of 365 days, and only from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. This is a small percentage of the bus schedule. This crosswalk is used by residents in the area, as well as kids that use the playground facilities when school is not in session, as well as kids and adults that use Rittler Park on weekends and during the summer. The bus stop should be located where they are safe all day and all year. It is ridiculous to use an existing red curb for a bus stop when the red curb is there to ensure visibility for the people using the crosswalk. You have spent a fortune on this crosswalk. If you had gone to the trouble of preventing cars and SUVs from parking there, 24/7/365, ever since the crosswalk was installed, then you don't want a bus to park there, either. You want people to cross the street behind the bus, and not in front of the bus.

"Safety problem #2: The proposed bus stops at Lum School are in a very complex traffic area. there are three houses between Sandalwood Isle and Waterview Isle on the north side of Otis. This is a short block, not a long block. Sand Creek Way and the Lum School dropoff lane intersect Otis on the south side between Sandalwood and Waterview. Add in a supercrosswalk which does not align with any of the four intersections, and you can imagine that cars are coming from all directions at the same time. All cars from these four intersections must turn onto Otis, as none go straight across. Having the crossing guards not let pedestrians cross while the bus is present is great for the pedestrians, but does nothing for the autos that are coming from each other from all directions. When the children are arriving at school in the morning, and leave in the afternoon, there are many vehicles parking on all nearby side streets, as well as in every available space on Otis, and every available space in the Lum School dropoff lane. Cars are turning onto and back out of Sandalwood Isle and Waterview Isle, and also entering Otis from the dropoff lane in Sandcreek Way. It is heavily congested. The supercrosswalk is in the middle of this very confused traffic pattern. Adding a bus to the mix only exacerbates the congestion and limits the visibility.

“The City of Alameda has put a great deal of effort into making pedestrian crossings as safe as possible. Do not take a step backwards!

“Although there are ramps located at the supercrosswalk at Otis, there are unrecognized ADA problems with putting a bus at Lum School. The only reason to place a bus stop on Otis at Willow and Grand is to attract riders. There are no cross streets in this area. North of Otis are one-block dead-end *cul de sacs* with low-density, single-family houses. South of Otis are four blocks of housing: two blocks of single family, and two blocks of medium-density apartments and condos. The bulk of the potential riders reside south of Otis. To get to Otis from the south, there are two routes: One is Ivy Walk, which leads directly to Otis. The other is Snowberry Walk which leads you into the back of Lum School, then along a driveway through the Lum School grounds to Sandcreek Way, approximately one block distance, then along Sandcreek Way for one block to Otis.

“ADA Problem #1: When school is not in session, there is a chain attached with a padlock across the driveway through Lum School. I can step over the chain, but a handicapped person cannot. You will have to tell the principal at Lum School to stop using the chain. Whatever the reason the chain serves will be eliminated. I do not know, but I suspect the chain reduces the likelihood of vandalism, as this driveway leads past the office entrance, which is not visible from the street or from the residences in the area. Also, as this parking lot is not visible from the street, and school is only in session during the day, and then only 185 days out of a 365 day year, the same reasons for closing the gates to the parking lot at Crown Beach at sunset would be in play for limiting access to this parking lot.

“ADA Problem #2: There is no ADA ramp to get up only the sidewalk on Sandcreek Way. My wife is disabled; we went to vote at Lum School last election. We used the supercrosswalk, but when we got to the area near the school office where the voting booths were located, there was no ADA ramp to get off the sidewalk to the driveway that leads to the office. This is the same driveway that would be used by people cutting through the schoolyard to get to a bus stop, should one be placed at Lum School.

“The City has indicated the building a bus stop at Ivy Walk would require painting and marking a crosswalk. I pointed out that the crosswalk at Heather Walk and Heather Isle does not have a painted crossing. That is the very next bus stop west of Grand. However, I was informed that the regulations now require newly installed bus stops to have a marked crossing, and the Arlington Isle stop does not need a crossing because it is grandfathered in under the old regulations. I do not believe that painting a crosswalk near Ivy Walk will encourage students at Lum School to cross Otis when they have the supercrosswalk at Lum School.

“To summarize: No one (other than an unnamed person on City staff) wants the bus stops. Shelve this proposal, and revisit it someday if someone actually expresses a need for a bus stop and you can buy the extra few minutes of run time that will be needed. And if you are absolutely compelled to put in a stop, put it on the safe side of crosswalks and intersecting streets so that it does not interfere with the visibility needed by us old, gray-headed pedestrians crossing this heavily used street, and vehicles entering the traffic on Otis Drive. A stop at Ivy Walk would be much safer than a stop at Lum School or a stop at Willow. Sincerely, Peter Muzio.”

*Commissioner McFarland* noted that in addition to the bus routing and timing, there was an issue of needed sidewalk improvements at some of the bus stops. He would like staff and AC Transit to address those issues.

*Acting Chair Ratto* appreciated the comments about accessibility on Shoreline, and asked staff to specifically to look into the Whitehall/Willow bus stop issue, particularly the poor condition of the stop. He acknowledged the costs factored into every decision that must be made, and he added that he had a great desire to serve on the subcommittee.

In response to a question by a member of the audience whether a resident could serve on the subcommittee, *Staff Khan* noted that staff was considering doing a survey of residents and riders in that area. He believed a public workshop would be the perfect forum to define what the subcommittee's scope would be, and suggested forming the subcommittee first. Staff intended to return in June. He noted that he was not sure if there was a precedent for a citizen serving on a subcommittee, and *Staff Bergman* noted that some subcommittee hearings had been open to the public.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* would support a subcommittee, and noted that the issue of cutting running time had not yet been addressed. He agreed that the subcommittee would be the perfect vehicle to address those issues, and volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

*Commissioner Krueger* also volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

*Acting Chair Ratto* noted that the subcommittee would work with staff and AC Transit, and would like *Liz Cleves* to serve as a liaison between the community group and the subcommittee.

*Liz Cleves* would like to nominate *Diane Voss* to serve because she was in school full-time.

*Staff Khan* noted that staff would try to schedule a meeting for the following week.

*Staff Bergman* noted that the public speakers' names have been added to the mailing list, and invited other members of the public to leave their contact information.

No action was taken.
----------------------

#### **7B. Citywide Curbside Bus Stop Access Action Plan**

***Outcome:*** TC to reaffirm City's practice of providing curbside access to bus stops and provide guidance regarding flexibility in this practice. Discussion/Action

*Staff Bergman* summarized the staff report, and added the City Council had directed the City Manager to work with the Commission to develop a plan to provide unobstructed curbside access to all bus stops in Alameda. Most of that work had been completed, and there were some remaining that were still underway, and were brought to the Transportation Technical Team (TTT) in March 2007. He noted that there were a number of residents and businesses who objected to the parking restrictions, generally with the impact on on-street parking. Staff wished

to bring the matter to the Transportation Commission to reaffirm the City's current practices regarding the provision of curbside access at bus stops, and to identify any areas where the policy could be flexible. He noted that the objections raised at the TTT meeting included:

1. A disabled resident indicated that having parking restrictions near his home would be a hardship;
2. A business owner stated that parking restrictions would harm his business;
3. A church member talked about parking restrictions exacerbating existing parking shortages during church events;
4. A resident stated that many parents use the on-street parking as they drop their children off at school.

He noted that most of the bus stop consolidation had been implemented, particularly on the 51, and that other lines could be revisited with respect to relocation or revisiting regarding potential problems that they cause

### **Open public comment.**

*Staff Bergman* noted that *Chair Knox White* also submitted comments on this item:

“Where staff feels that neighborhoods have identified major constraints due to lost street parking, staff level study and decision-making should be acceptable to see if existing City policy would allow for consolidation, stop move, etc. Recent changes to the bus stop placement policy allow for more flexibility in placing stops, as was used in the recommendation for Otis. The City of Alameda maintains very stringent minimum parking standards for both residences and businesses. As such, before too much discussion is had about removing bus stops, these standards and the usage of the mandated parking should be evaluated, or the City should get rid of the requirement.

“In residential areas, staff should also identify whether the City mandated parking for autos is being used as well, before studying major stop location redesign. Household garages used for storage, etc., eat up a lot of onstreet parking as well. Perhaps a policy that neighborhoods do a parking study, looking at available off-street spots, use of those spots and other street uses should be considered a first step. For those areas where a high percentage of off-street parking is being used for parking, then staff can determine if the removal of 2 to 3 spots will necessitate parkers to walk more than 100 feet, 10 percent of the bus rider maximum walk. If this is found to be the case, then bus stop removal would be weighed as a measure of total daily ridership versus total daily parking usage. Whichever is higher would represent the solution which maximizes community benefit.

“In business districts – Park Street and Webster Street – have parking removed for stops already, and shops are doing well financially. Staff should try to accommodate parking needs in neighborhood business districts without removing stops. The Transportation Commission has historically supported transit in commercial areas.”

*Staff Bergman* noted that an email was sent to him by a business owner who had spoken at the TTT meeting:

“We are owners of Wilmot’s Books, a small independent bookstore that has been in existence on the West Side of Alameda for the last year and a half. During that time, we have run a successful business, despite being in a tough industry and being located a bit off the main business section of town. We’ve also been happy to become part of the community and a strong presence in the neighborhood for culture, literature and the arts, and most importantly, a place where people can come and hang out and shop. We are located at 478 Central Avenue, which is the intersection of 5<sup>th</sup> and Central Avenue, and is one of the locations that would possible be affected by the proposed changes in parking.

“While our business is successful, it is also quite vulnerable. The difference in our succeeding and encountering great challenges can be the difference of just a few customers each day. The difference of a good day versus a bad day is directly linked to the parking in front of our store. While parking is already quite scarce in our neighborhood, the changes in parking would take away the three most important spots we have, which are directly in front of the store late in the afternoon. Since the changes proposed for directly across the street going in the opposite direction affect the early morning, people living in the neighborhood would be more likely to park in front of our store in the evening. The net result is that we would lose our most important parking for over half the hours that our store is in operation.

“While we are very supportive of public transportation, we are also aware that a bus has never stopped to drop off anyone at this stop. The bus stop is not used, and certainly not needed. It is located two blocks from the school, so the students simply do not use this stop to be dropped off. If a change is going to be discussed, it should be to get rid of this stop that causes nothing but confusion. I cannot put it any simpler than this: If you choose to take away our parking, even for just a few hours at a time, you will force us to move, and we will need to shut down this store. It is my assumption that the City of Alameda would rather have an independent bookstore instead of parking for a bus stop that isn’t used. Thank you for your consideration, Tim and Mary Wilmot.”

*Staff Bergman* noted that the stop he referred to only serves one of the school lines, so the restriction was only for the hours when that bus was in operation.

*Joyce Larrick*, representing herself and *Rebecca LeValley*, who was unable to attend. She read *Ms. LeValley’s* comments:

“As a middle-aged and short bus rider, it is difficult enough climbing on and off some of the larger cruise line-type buses currently in service without the added obstruction of winding through parked cars to get to the bus. I think the tragic accident in San Francisco yesterday where a handicapped man was killed because a truck driver did not see his low silhouette in the crosswalk highlights some of the potential dangers to bus riders trying to board buses through high-profile SUVs, etc. I cannot see the possible advantage to a business of having their customers frustrated by the inability to get in or out of a parking space blocked by a boarding or discharging bus. Frustration leads to rash action and injuries. While we caution children against

chasing balls out into the street between parked cars, and now you want to send bus riders into the same danger.”

*Ms. Larrick* noted that following her involvement with Earth Day, she supported bus ridership to reduce pollution and congestion. She believed the City should encourage more people to use the bus.

*Susan Decker*, Alameda Transit Advocates, was sympathetic to the concerns of business owners, and noted that bus riders were customers, too. She did not believe the City should take a step backwards on not providing access to the bus, and believe that all stops should have access. She believed the effects on a business would be minimal, and that the problems of the transit stops were outweighed by the greater good. She suggested that moving the stop a block in one direction or another may be a good compromise without adversely affecting good bus stop spacing.

*Deborah James* believed the school bus was the only bus that stopped by the book store. She noted that the 63 was often late and jam-packed because it served two high schools. She added that people often use the bus stop as a dropoff for Chipman Middle School.

*Geoff Kline* wished to respectfully disagree with the transit advocates, and believed there were a number of places in Alameda, especially on lightly traveled streets, where “flag stops” [where the stop is marked by a sign and there are no parking restrictions] could be installed rather than removing parking spaces where parking was problematic. He did not believe that painting all the curbs red was the solution, and he did not believe it was realistic for everyone to get out of their cars. He believed the drivers should be able to have a place to park.

*Deborah James* noted that riders at flag stops would not be visible to the bus driver unless the rider ran into the street.

### **Closed public comment.**

*Commissioner Krueger* believed it was important to be flexible, and to listen and weigh the concerns of all parties in order to be fair. He did not believe every case should be an exception. He did not support the idea of a flag stop. He believed the times of the restriction should be negotiated, based on the hours of operation. He believed assessment should be made to move or consolidate stops. With respect to *Chair Knox White’s* comment about the lack of parking in residential neighborhoods, he suggested that a parking survey be employed to determine if garages are being used for vehicles.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* agreed with *Commissioner Krueger’s* comments. He believed that bus service was an asset rather than a liability to the community. He supported flexibility as described by *Commissioner Krueger*.

*Commissioner McFarland* supported the flexibility as outlined by *Commissioner Krueger*, and believed the policy should stand.

*Commissioner Subramaniam* believed that policies were in place in order to have consistent implementation across the City, and did not believe that having exceptions would benefit the City.

*Acting Chair Ratto* noted that it was best to work with Public Works and AC Transit to deal with red curbs. He supported the bus plazas on Park and Webster Street, and believed that the Transportation Commission might as well disband if they could not stand firm on this policy. Pertaining to flexibility, he believed that staff should assist residents in consolidating bus stops and work with AC Transit because there were exceptions to the rule. He believed the burden of proof was on the appellant, and they need to show a real need for the parking spaces. He believed the garage should be used for cars and not storage.

*Commissioner Krueger* moved the following:

- 1) All bus stops should have parking prohibitions during the hours of bus operations.
- 2) If there are problems with eliminating parking at a particular location, the relocation or consolidation of bus stops should be considered. In the case of an appeal of a decision to remove on-street parking, staff should work with the appellant to explore options for flexibility, but the burden of proof is on the appellant to demonstrate the need for the on-street parking spaces.
- 3) The level of bus ridership and demand for on-street parking at the location should be considered in such decisions – if the parking demand is high and bus ridership is low, preservation of parking should be given greater emphasis.
- 4) Any changes to bus stop locations should ensure consistency with the Long Range Transit Plan's recommended bus stop spacing of approximately 1000 feet.
- 5) City should explore ways to encourage private property owners to make better use of existing off-street parking.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* seconded. Motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

#### **7C. Review and comment on Civic Center Parking Garage Management Plan Policies and Procedures.**

**Outcome:** *TC to review and provide comments on draft Parking Management and Operations Plan.* Discussion/Action

*Staff Eric Fonstein*, Economic Development Coordinator, Development Services Department, summarized the staff report and described the scope and background of the proposed parking structure, which should be completed by December 2007. He noted there was a perception of reluctance to use a parking structure if it is difficult or complicated to use.

*Commissioner Subramaniam* inquired whether car sharing had been considered, such as in Oakland and San Francisco. *Acting Chair Ratto* noted that had not been examined at this time.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* noted that car sharing was business operation, and that enough business must be generated for it to be economically viable.

### **Open public comment.**

*Jim Strehlow* noted that he was primarily a bicycle rider and pedestrian, and recalled the discussion of this item at the City Council meeting. He noted that there could be alternatives to paying for parking, such as free parking or alternative transportation, as well as merchant validation programs. He requested clarification of the TDM page 1, section 1, line 4-6, which stated that it would generate limited revenue to pay for operations, and the remainder would repay the loan. He would like to see the profit and loss for the next three years.

### **Closed public comment.**

*Staff Fonstein* explained the attendant and gate approach, and noted that the 50 cents per hour rate was similar to the parking rates on the street. He further explained the details of the structure pay-by system, and noted that it was similar to eight of BART's East Bay parking structures. He noted that a gate approach was twice as capital-intensive, requiring ticket dispensers and receptors, as well as the gates themselves and staff required for maintenance, emergencies or malfunctions.

*Commissioner Krueger* believed it was unusual to pay for the next time the driver would use the parking structure. He inquired whether it could be purchased the same day if movie tickets were ordered in advance. *Staff Fonstein* noted that he would consider that idea.

*Staff Fonstein* stated that there would be a four-hour maximum. He noted that daily parking could be used via a monthly parking program.

A discussion of parking enforcement ensued.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* asked if any consideration had been made to using the garage as a park and ride lot, and noted that the garage will be very close to the most heavily traveled transit streets in the City. He stated that given the maximum number of hours people would be permitted to park, use as a park and ride lot would not be possible.

*Acting Chair Ratto* believed that if there was a surplus of monthly passes within the district, that park and ride could be considered.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* noted that could be an attractive possibility for revenue generation, although that was not the primary purpose of the garage.

*Commissioner Krueger* believed that onstreet parking should be more expensive to encourage people to use the garage.

*Acting Chair Ratto* noted that the Class II bike lane on Central would be restored in front of the high school, and that the diagonal parking be converted to parallel parking.

*Staff Khan* noted that the City was waiting for construction to be completed.

*Acting Chair Ratto* noted that was important, and should be included in the report. He thanked staff for an excellent job on this item over the many months of development.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* moved to recommend that the City Council accept the proposal, including restoring the Class II bike lane; prevalidation with a code for movie tickets; examine car sharing; examine the optimum pricing of street parking versus garage parking; transit riders included in monthly passes; return to parallel parking on Central. *Commissioner McFarland* seconded. Motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

## 8. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

*Staff Khan* noted that staff wished to discuss the EIR for Harbor Bay Village, which was suggested to come before the Transportation Commission by the Planning Department. He distributed the Draft EIR document, and indicated that the public comments would close May 4, 2007. He invited the Commissioners to request that it be agendized, and he would request that the Planning Department extend the public comment period to accommodate Transportation Commission comments.

*Staff Khan* handed out bicycle surveys to invite comments regarding pedestrian/bicycle access issues. He noted that it was also available on the City's website.

*Acting Chair Ratto* noted that the Park Street Spring Festival would be held on Mother's Day weekend (May 12 and 13). He noted that last year, 40,000 people attended the downtown festival.

*Staff Bergman* noted that the draft Transportation Element has been circulated to the various boards and commissions, including the Economic Development Commission, Commission on Disabilities, the Climate Protection Task Force, Rec and Parks Commission and the Housing Commission. It would be completed in mid-June.

*Staff Bergman* noted that the next ILC meeting would be held May 31, 2007, and that further information would be emailed to the Commissioners.

*Acting Chair Ratto* complimented *Staff Khan* on doing an excellent job in front of the EDC the previous week.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.